



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,984	02/20/2002	Erol Basturk	P4522	7502
24739	7590	06/06/2006	EXAMINER	
HALIYUR, VENKATESH N				
AROMAS, CA 95004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2616

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/079,984	BASTURK, EROL
	Examiner Venkatesh Haliyur	Art Unit 2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/05/2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1–39 are still pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dobbins et al. [US Pat: 5,751,971].

Regarding claims 1,13, Dobbins et al. disclosed an apparatus and method in “Internet Protocol (IP) Work Group Routing”, for multiple router interfaces communication system having a plurality of physical communication ports, a hierarchical (levels) bond (associate) communication interface comprising a logical interface (IP router interface) as a component of the bond at a top level (high level) of the hierarchy, and a first subordinate logical interface at a second level (subnet/low-level) of the hierarchy as a component of the top-level logical interface [Fig 2, columns 1-2, column 3, lines 1-37, column 4, lines 5-11, column 5, 1-67, column 6, 1-28].

Regarding claims 2-4,8-10, Dobbins et al. disclosed the top level and the second level comprising one or more physical interfaces [items 12A, 12 B of Fig 2] for multilevel networks [items 13 and 14 of Fig 2, column 3, lines 1-5, column 4, lines 5-11].

Regarding claims 5,6,11,12, Dobbins et al. disclosed a data router [item 11 of Fig 2] in a data packet network and data packet network is the Internet network [item 16 of Fig 2, column 5, lines 47-52].

Regarding claims 7,13, Dobbins et al. disclosed a communication system having a plurality of physical communication ports, a method for grouping ports in data routing, comprising the steps of defining a logical interface at a top level of a hierarchical bond and defining a first subjugate logical interface at a second level of the hierarchical bond as an element of the top-level logical interface and routing data by addressing the top-level bond, which then uses logical and physical components of the hierarchy for data transmission and further disclosed a control system [item 70 of Fig 9] for managing links in data routing, comprising a first portion recording availability status of the hierarchical bonds for routing of data by monitoring characteristics of both logical and physical component links of the hierarchical bonds and a second portion providing configuration input for use in the monitoring by the first portion. [Fig 2 & Fig 9, column 2, lines 42-57, column 4, lines 5-11, column 5, lines 1-67, column 6, 1-28].

Regarding claims 14-17, Dobbins et al. disclosed thresholds (limiting or locking interfaces) are configured for an interface characteristic through the second portion for individual ones of the logical interfaces, a logical interface considered up or down according to the instant value of the characteristic for the interface in relation to the

value of the configured threshold and the threshold configured for a logical interface is an up threshold such that the logical interface is considered up if the instant value of the threshold characteristic for the logical interface has the configured relationship to the configured value of the up threshold monitoring [Fig 2 & Fig 9, column 2, lines 42 - 57, column 4, lines 5-11, column 5, lines 1-67, column 6, 1-28].

Regarding claims 18,19, Dobbins et al. disclosed the control system wherein the first portion periodically evaluates the status of the hierarchical bonds for routing data by determining the up or down status of each bond, beginning with the lowest level in the hierarchy and proceeding upward to the highest level of the bond and the second portion comprising an SNMP interface for configuring bond characteristics and ability to accept computer instructions [Figs 2 & Fig 9, columns 1-13, column 14, lines 1-47].

Regarding claims 20-24,34-37, Dobbins et al. disclosed the control system of claim 13 wherein the communication system comprises a plurality of nodes each having a plurality of physical ports, wherein bonds are defined for individual nodes using the ports specific to the nodes, and the control system comprises a plurality of first portions each specific to an individual one of the nodes, and a common second portion providing configuration input to the plurality of nodes and the characteristic for thresholds associated with an interface is the up or down state of components of the interface, expressed as a number up or a number down and the characteristic for thresholds associated with an interface is a percentage of the number of components of the interface having an up or a down state and the characteristic for thresholds is a fixed

bandwidth value and the characteristic for thresholds is a percentage of potential bandwidth [Figs 2 & Fig 9, columns 1-13, column 14, lines 1-47].

Regarding claims 25-29, Dobbins et al disclosed a data router comprising a plurality of physical communication ports, at least one hierarchical bond having a logical interface as a component of the bond at a top level of the hierarchy, and a first subjugate logical interface at a second level of the hierarchy as a component of the top-level logical interface, the bond comprising at one or more levels one or more of the physical communication ports; and a control system for managing links in data routing, the control system having a first portion recording availability status of the hierarchical bonds for routing of data by monitoring status either up or down of both logical and physical component links of the at least one hierarchical bond, and a second portion providing configuration input for use in the monitoring by the first portion and disclosed the data packet network and the Internet and the router uses logical and physical components of the hierarchy for data transmission [Fig 2, columns 1-2, column 3, lines 1-37, column 4, lines 5-11, column 5, 1-67, column 6, 1-28].

Regarding claims 30-33,38,39, Dobbins et al disclosed one or more thresholds are configured for an interface characteristic through the second portion for individual ones of the logical interfaces, a logical interface considered up or down according to the instant value of the characteristic for the interface in relation to the value of the configured associated up and down threshold values [Figs 2 & Fig 9, columns 1-8, column 9, lines 1-25].

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 04/05/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner respectfully traverses the applicants arguments as in Remarks (pp 9 – 12) as follows-

a) With regard to applicant's argument that the prior art of reference does not teach hierarchical structure (page 11, para 3-4), Dobbins et al disclosed a hierarchical structure for Network (**Fig 2, items 12A /12B**) and sub-network (**Fig 2, 13A /13B/14**) and further disclosed that a multi-interface router has physical interface and virtual interfaces (logical or IP address) **[col 2, lines 41-67, col 5, lines 43-57, col 10, lines 30-65, abstract]**.

b) In response to applicant's argument, see Remarks (pp 9 -12) for claims 1,7,13 and 25 and dependent claims 2-6,8-12,14-24 and 26-39 that the reference fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the attention to Venkatesh Haliyur whose phone number is 571-272-8616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached @ (571)-272-3139. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-2600 or fax to 571-273-8300.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

Venkatesh Haliyur

Patent Examiner

05/31/06


RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER